

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., a national
banking association,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SFR INVESTMENTS POOL 1, LLC, a
Nevada limited-liability company; THE
FOOTHILLS AT WINGFIELD
HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, a Nevada
non-profit corporation; FULLER JENKINS
CLARKSON, a Nevada professional
corporation,

Defendants.

SFR INVESTMENTS POOL 1, LLC, a
Nevada limited liability company,

Counter-Claimant,

vs.

WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., a national
banking association; MORTGAGE
ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION SYSTEMS,
INC., its successors and assigns, as Nominee
Beneficiary for DHI MORTGAGE
COMPANY, a Texas limited partnership;
BRIAN MCKAY, an individual; LAWRENCE
D. MCKAY, an individual,

Counter-Defendant/Cross-Defendants.

Case No. 3:17-cv-00332-LRH-WGC

**STIPULATION AND ORDER TO
EXTEND TIME TO FILE REPLIES IN
SUPPORT OF WELLS FARGO'S
MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT AND SFR'S MOTION
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
(FIRST REQUEST)**

1 Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (“Wells Fargo”), and Defendant SFR Investments Pool 1, LLC
2 (“SFR”), by and through their respective counsel (collectively the “Parties”), for good cause
3 shown, hereby stipulate and agree to an extension for SFR to submit its Reply in support of
4 Motion for Summary Judgment, and for Wells Fargo to submit its Reply in support of Motion for
5 Summary Judgment. Wells Fargo and SFR each filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on May 2,
6 2018 [ECF Nos. 44 and 48]. The Parties each filed a response to Motion for Summary Judgment
7 on June 13, 2018 [ECF Nos. 68 and 69]. The Parties’ deadline to file replies in support of their
8 respective Motions for Summary Judgment is June 27, 2018. The Parties request the Court
9 extend the Parties’ Reply deadline to July 18, 2018. This is the Parties’ first extension request.

10 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1) and Local Rule 6-1, there exists good
11 cause to grant this extension to respond for the following reasons:

12 1. This extension is sought both because the Parties and their counsel require
13 additional time to meaningfully prepare and respond to the competing motions for summary
14 judgment and to address the numerous arguments raised therein.

15 2. On June 26, 2018, Wells Fargo and SFR agreed to the extension requested herein
16 to keep the briefing schedule on their simultaneous motions for summary judgment the same as
17 between the two Parties.

18 3. This stipulated extension request is sought in good faith and is not made for the
19 purpose of delay.

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 Therefore, Wells Fargo and SFR jointly agree for an extension to July 18, 2018, for SFR
2 to file its Reply in support of Motion for Summary Judgment [ECF No. 48] and for Wells Fargo
3 to file its Reply in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment [ECF No. 44].
4

5 Dated: June 26, 2018

Dated: June 26, 2018

6 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

KIM GILBERT EBRON

7
8 By: /s/ Michael Paretti

9 Kelly H. Dove, Esq.
10 Nevada Bar No. 10569
11 Michael Paretti, Esq.
12 Nevada Bar No. 13926
13 3883 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 1100
14 Las Vegas, NV 89169
15 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Wells Fargo Bank,*
16 *N.A.*


By: /s/ Diana S. Ebron

Diana S. Ebron, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 10580
Jacqueline A. Gilbert, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 10593
Karen L. Hanks, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 9578
7625 Dean Martin Drive, Suite 110
Las Vegas, Nevada 89139
Attorneys for Defendant SFR Investments
Pool 1, LLC

17
18 **ORDER**

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 DATED this 27th day of June, 2018.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28


LARRY R. HICKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE